



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

10/042,403

01/09/2002

Glenn C. Godoy

END920010097US1

9024

7590

06/09/2004

John R. Pivnichny, Ph.D.
IBM Corporation, N50/040-4
1701 North Street
Endicott, NY 13760

EXAMINER

NGUYEN, CAM LINH T

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2171

DATE MAILED: 06/09/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/042,403

Applicant(s)

GODOY ET AL.

Examiner

CamLinh Nguyen

Art Unit

2171

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 09 January 2002.
- 2a) ☐ This action is FINAL. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-19 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-19 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 09 January 2002 is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☒ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 2.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Drawings

1. The drawings are objected to under 37 CFR 1.83(a) because they fail to show number(s) as described in the specification. Any structural detail that is essential for a proper understanding of the disclosed invention should be shown in the drawing. MPEP § 608.02(d). A proposed drawing correction or corrected drawings are required in reply to the Office action to avoid abandonment of the application. The objection to the drawings will not be held in abeyance.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

2. The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

3. Claims 1 – 19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention.

In claims 1 - 9, and 19, Applicant refers to "modeled database". However, Applicant fails to define the meaning of "modeled database" in the Specification.

4. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

Art Unit: 2171

5. Claims 1 – 9, 19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite in that it fails to point out what is included or excluded by the claim language.

This claim is an omnibus type claim.

In claims 1 - 9, and 19, Applicant refers to “modeled database”. However, Applicant fails to define the meaning of “modeled database” in the Specification. The Examiner is not sure the meaning of these terms. In the interest of prosecution, it is assumed that the modeled database is a regular database that stored model business data/information.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

6. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

7. Claims 1, 6 – 10, 15 - 19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Iyengar et al (U.S. 6,018,627).

♦ As per claim 1, 10, 19,

Iyengar discloses a method of updating business control data comprising:

- “ Developing a model of business rules and building said rules into a modeled database” See Fig. 1 and 7, col. 3, lines 64 – 65, col. 4, lines 27 – 33. As noted above, a “modeled database” corresponds to the “repository 20” that stored

business information or enterprise modeling. "Business rules" corresponds to the "business modeling" (col. 8, lines 45 – 49).

- "Entering business control data into said modeled database" See Fig. 7 – 9, col. 9, lines 23 – 48. "Business control data" corresponds to the "business logic data".
- "Disseminating to a plurality of applications, respective portions of said business control data according to said business rules" col. 3, lines 1 – 2, col. 12, lines 35 – 51.

♦ As per claim 6 - 7, 15 – 16,

- "Wherein said business control data is entered into said modeled database using a common data administration application" See Fig. 2B - 3, col. 7, lines 29 – 43. "A common data administration application" corresponds to the application window 35.
- "Wherein said common data administration application is adapted to receive input from logged on individuals and from an automated feed from a source system" See Fig. 1. The "legacy integration" corresponds to the source system.

♦ As per claim 8 - 9, 17 – 18,

- "Entering additional rules into said common data administration application" and "Wherein said business control data is entered into said modeled database according to said additional rules" See Fig. 4 – 9.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

8. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

9. Claims 2 – 5, 11 – 14, are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Iyengar et al (U.S. 6,018,627) in view of Souder et al (U.S. 5,724,556).

♦ As per claim 2 - 5, 11 – 14,

Iyengar discloses a system for developing business application using the Unified Modeling Language (UML). However, Iyengar does not clearly disclose: Rules are built to define a dissemination structure, wherein said structure has a plurality of instances of said modeled database; wherein said plurality of instances run on a corresponding plurality of servers located in corresponding geographical locations; wherein said geographical locations are in disparate continents.

Referring to col. 1, lines 21 – 45. Iyengar teaches that each rule or business model can be applied to a particular environment. Iyengar also teaches that the deployment of component over the Internet (col. 11, lines 16 – 46). Clearly, Iyengar implicitly teaches about the uses of plurality of servers located in disparate continents by using the Internet. Therefore, when building the business rules, the rules must define the dissemination structure.

On the other hand, Souder et al (U.S. 5,724,556) discloses a distributed system that includes a distributed modeler for defining business models wherein the business model comprising business locations and the business functions that occur at each

business location (See col. 11, lines 40 – 60, Souder). Souder discloses in Fig. 23 that each location only contains specified modules. The table in Fig. 23 corresponds the structure in the instance application. The plurality of instance corresponds to the plurality of location in the table. Each instance can be located in different sites (col. 1, lines 29 –42, Souder).

It would have been obvious to one with ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to apply the teaching of Souder into the invention of lyengar . because the combination would provide more control in accessing data in different nodes or locations (col. 4, lines 13 – 32, Souder).

Conclusion

10. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

- Johnson et al (U.S. 5,644,764) discloses a method for supporting object modeling in a repository.
- Reid et al (US006560592B1) discloses a multi-model computer database storage system with integrated rule engine.
- Daniel Linstedt (US 20020161778A1) discloses a method of data warehousing and building business intelligence using a data storage model.
- Mehr et al (US006438547B1) discloses a computer readable data product for managing sales information.
- Yvonna Smith (US006662172B1) discloses an intelligence business rules module.

- Susan Whitehead (US 20020199182A1) discloses a method providing convergent solution to end-to-end, adaptive business application management.


11. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to CamLinh Nguyen whose telephone number is 305-1951.

The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Safet Metjahic can be reached on 308-1436. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

LN


WAYNE AMSBURY
PRIMARY PATENT EXAMINER